## REMARKS

Claims 250-322 are currently pending in the application, of which claims 250, 262, 274, 287, 299, and 311 are independent claims.

In view of the following Remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and timely withdrawal of the pending objections and rejections for the reasons discussed below.

### *Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102*

Claims 250-252, 254, 258, 259, 262-264, 269, 270, 274-279, 287-289, 294, 295, 299-301, 303, 307, 308, 311-313, 318 and 319 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being allegedly anticipated by U. S. Patent No. 5,946,634 issued to Korpela ("Korpela"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

In order for a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) to be proper, a single reference must disclose every claimed feature. To be patentable, a claim need only recite a single novel feature that is not disclosed in the cited reference. Thus, the failure of a cited reference to disclose one or more claimed features renders the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejection improper.

Applicants submit that Korpela fails to disclose every limitation of the present invention.

Claim 250 recites, inter alia, "recognizing an operating type of the core network on the basis of a core network operating type information and core network information contained in a message" (emphasis added). The examiner asserts that Korpela discloses these features at Korpela's Fig. 8. See Office Action, page 3. Specifically, the examiner asserts that Korpela's backbone network type code 102 discloses "core network operating type information." Applicants disagree.

Referring to Fig. 8 and col. 6, lines 15-25 of Korpela, a signal transmitted from the radio access network includes a country identification portion 101, a network identifying portion 103, and a backbone network type code 102. The backbone network type code 102 indicates, at

most, "whether the network is, for example, a GSM network, a B-ISDN network, and so on," which is distinct from a core network operating type. Korpela, col. 6, lines 24-25. Neither the country identification portion 101, the network identifying portion 103, nor the backbone network type code 102 discloses "core network operating type information" such as information that indicates whether a core network is a global system for mobile communications-mobile application part (GSM-MAP) network or an ANSI-41 network.

Applicants' position is further supported by section 10.2.1.1 CN Domain Identity of 3GPP Technical Specification TS 25.331 version 1.1.0 (1999-06), which is attached as an exhibit. Section 10.2.1.1 defines the CN Domain Identity as the element that "[p]oints out the core network domain (e.g. IP or PSTN/ISDN CN domain)" (emphasis added). Similarly, Korpela defines the backbone network type as "GSM networks, GSM evolutionary networks, or broadband ISDN (B-ISDN) networks." Korpela, col. 2, lines 38-40. Thus, it can be seen that Korpela's backbone network type corresponds to the CN Domain Identity. To the contrary, the CN Domain Identity in the present application is defined in the specification as a portion of "information related to core network," which is distinct from "core network operating type information" recited in claim 250. See, e.g., Specification, page 42, lines 14-16. More specifically, as described in reference to Fig. 9A:

> core network operating type information CN Type of "0" or "1" is written in a first field of the Sync channel message and information elements related to the GSM-MAP network, PLMN identity information PLMN_ID, CN domain identity information and NAS system information, are sequentially written in the subsequent fields of the message.

Specification, page 44, lines 17-26 (emphasis added). Therefore, the CN domain identity refers to domain rather than operating type, and contains different information and is written in different message fields than the core network operating type information. Accordingly,

Korpela's backbone network type code 102, which corresponds to the CN domain identity, does not disclose "core network operating type information."

Thus, because the country identification portion 101, the network identifying portion 103, and the backbone network type code 102 fail to disclose "core network operating type information," Korpela fails to disclose every feature of claim 250.

Similarly, claim 262 recites, *inter alia*, "detection means for recognizing an operating type of the core network on the basis of a core network operating type information and core network information in a message" (emphasis added). Claim 274 recites, *inter alia*, "recognizing an operating type of the core network on the basis of a core network operating type information and core network information contained in a message" (emphasis added). Claim 311 recites, *inter alia*, "detection means for recognizing an operating type of the core network on the basis of a core network operating type information and core network information in a message" (emphasis added).

For at least the reasons asserted above with respect to claim 250, Korpela fails to disclose that a message contains "core network operating type information." Accordingly, for at least this reason, Korpela fails to disclose every limitation of claims 262, 274, and 311.

Claim 287 recites, *inter alia*, "detection means for recognizing an operating type of the core network on the basis of a core network operating type information and core network information" (emphasis added). Claim 299 recites, *inter alia*, "recognizing an operating type of the core network on the basis of a core network operating type information and core network information" (emphasis added).

For at least the reasons asserted above with respect to claim 250, Korpela fails to disclose "recognizing an operating type of the core network on the basis of a core network

operating type information and core network information" (emphasis added). Accordingly, for at least this reason, Korpela fails to disclose every limitation of claims 287 and 299.

Since none of the other prior art of record discloses or suggests all the features of the claimed invention, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 250, 262, 274, 287, 299, and 311, and all the claims that depend therefrom are allowable. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejection of claims 250-252, 254, 258, 259, 262-264, 269, 270, 274-279, 287-289, 294, 295, 299-301, 303, 307, 308, 311-313, 318 and 319.

***Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103***

To establish a prima facie case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the reference or references, when combined, must disclose or suggest all of the claim limitations. The motivation to modify the prior art and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art and not based upon a patent applicant's disclosure. *See in re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

Claims 253, 265, 277, 278, 290, 302 and 314 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Korpela. Applicants traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 250, 262, 274, 287, 299, and 311 are allowable over Korpela alone. The examiner's purported modification of Korpela fails to cure the deficiencies of Korpela noted above with regard to claims 250, 262, 274, 287, 299, and 311.

Hence, claims 253, 265, 277, 278, 290, 302 and 314 are allowable at least because they depend from allowable base claims.

Claims 255-257, 266-268, 272, 280-282, 291-293, 297, 304-306, 315-317, and 321 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Korpela in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,137,806 issued to Martinez ("Martinez"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 250, 262, 274, 287, 299, and 311 are allowable over Korpela. Martinez fails to cure the deficiencies of Korpela noted above with regard to claims 250, 262, 274, 287, 299, and 311. Hence, claims 255-257, 266-268, 272, 280-282, 291-293, 297, 304-306, 315-317, and 321 are allowable at least because they depend from allowable base claims.

Claims 255-257, 266-268, 272, 280-282, 291-293, 297, 304-306, 315-317 and 321 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Korpela in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,389,008 issued to Lupien, *et al.* ("Lupien"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 250, 262, 274, 287, 299, and 311 are allowable over Korpela. Lupien fails to cure the deficiencies of Korpela noted above with regard to claims 250, 262, 274, 287, 299, and 311. Hence, claims 255-257, 266-268, 272, 280-282, 291-293, 297, 304-306, 315-317 and 321 are allowable at least because they depend from allowable base claims.

Claims 260, 261, 271, 273, 285, 286, 296, 298, 309, 310, 320, and 322 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Korpela in view of 3GPP TS

25.331 V3.0.0 (1999-10) ("Specification"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 250, 262, 274, 287, 299, and 311 are allowable over Korpela. The Specification fails to cure the deficiencies of Korpela noted above with regard to claims 250, 262, 274, 287, 299, and 311. Hence, claims 260, 261, 271, 273, 285, 286, 296, 298, 309, 310, 320, and 322 are allowable at least because they depend from allowable base claims.

## CONCLUSION

Applicants believe that a full and complete response has been made to the pending Office Action and respectfully submit that all of the stated grounds for rejection have been overcome or rendered moot. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims are allowable and that the application is in condition for allowance.

Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative at the number below to expedite prosecution.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/hae-chan park/

Hae-Chan Park
Reg. No. 50,114

Date: January 3, 2007

**CUSTOMER NUMBER: 58027**
H.C. Park & Associates, PLC
8500 Leesburg Pike
Suite 7500
Vienna, VA 22182
Tel: 703-288-5105
Fax: 703-288-5139
HCP/WMH/kbs

# 10.2 Information element functional definitions

## 10.2.1 CN Information elements

### 10.2.1.1 CN domain identity

Points out the core network domain (e.g. IP or PSTN/ISDN CN domain).

### 10.2.1.2 NAS binding info

A field with non-access stratum information to bind a RAB to the non-access stratum. This information is transparent to RRC.

### 10.2.1.3 NAS message

A non-access stratum message to be transferred transparently through UTRAN.

### 10.2.1.4 NAS system information

System information that belongs to the non-access stratum (e.g. LAC, RA code etc). This information is transparent to RRC.

### 10.2.1.5 PLMN identity

| Parameters | REFERENCE | TYPE | NOTE |
|---|---|---|---|
| MCC, Mobile Country Code | | M | |
| MNC, Mobile Network Code | | M | |

## 10.2.2 UTRAN mobility Information elements

### 10.2.2.1 Cell identity

Identity of a cell within a PLMN.

*Note: The necessity and usage of this information element is FFS.*

### 10.2.2.2 Cell selection and re-selection info

| Parameters | REFERENCE | TYPE | NOTE | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Standby allowed reception level (dBm) | | M | | The usage of these parameters needs clarification FFS. |
| Standby prohibited reception level (dBm) | | M | | |
| Threshold for Cell Re-selection (dB) | | M | | |
| Allowed reception SIR (dB) | | M | | |
| Radio link timeout | | | | |